

ARGUMENTS/REMARKS

1. Claims 1-10 were rejected under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Houck. Insofar as this rejection might be applied to the claims now in the application, it is respectfully traversed.


Each of the independent claims 1, 4, and 6 have been amended to include limitations that are neither met by nor obvious in view of Houck. More particularly, each of these claims now recite that there are two wings with inner ends that are closely adjacent to each other in the working position, forming a generally continuous line across the width of the seeder. Houck is directed to a frame system that permits the wings to be lifted and rotated into a fore-and-aft position for convenient transport. It requires three sections—a center section 30 that is not part of either of the wings is generally fixed, but raised separately from the lower working position. In any event, Houck would not function in accordance with its intended purpose if the two wings were long enough to have their inner ends closely adjacent to each other. Houck does not show the claimed structure and does not even remotely suggest the limitations that are missing therefrom.

2. In summary, claims 1, 3, 4, and 6 have been amended, claim 2 has been cancelled, and claims 1 and 3-10 remain in the application. Applicant believes that the claims as herein presented are allowable, and respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn and all remaining claims be allowed. No new matter has been added.

Pursuant to currently recommended Patent Office practice, the Examiner is expressly authorized to call Applicant's attorney, collect, at Lancaster, Pennsylvania, if in his judgment disposition of this application could be expedited or if he considers the application ready for final disposition by other than allowance.

Date: June 7, 2005

Respectfully submitted,



John B. Mitchell
Registration No. 26,485
Customer No. 26637
Patent Attorney for
Case Corporation
Phone (717) 314-2844